1952

Role playing as a leadership training technique for non-commissioned officers of the United States Marine Corps.

Sweeney, John Brian.

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

http://hdl.handle.net/10945/24824

ROLE-PLAYING AS A LEADERSHIP TRAINING TECHNIQUE FOR NON COMMISIONED OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

JOHN BRIAN SWEENEY

ROLE-PLAYING AS A LEADERSHIP TRAINING TECHNIQUE FOR NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts

By

JOHN BRIAN SWEENEY, B.S.

The Ohio State University

1952

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to Colonel William Buse, U. S. Marine Corps, and the Commanding General, Second Marine Division, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, for making this study possible. The author is particularly indebted to Major John Masko, U. S. Marine Corps and Second Lieutenant Edward Feigan, U. S. Marine Corps, for their patience and co-operation in actually conducting the experiment. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. John Horrocks for his generous advice during the course of the study.

J. B. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The present study has two purposes: first, to measure changes in student attitude toward leadership resulting from the use of "role-playing" as a training technique as compared with measured changes resulting from the use of conventional techniques, such as the lecture, training film, and discussion or conference, when each type of technique is used in the instruction of comparable classes in a troop school; and second, to determine if "role-playing," which has enjoyed such popular success in certain industrial supervisory personnel training programs, might be an effective technique in the formal training of comparable supervisory personnel (i.e., noncommissioned officers) in the Marine Corps.

The aims of the study make necessary the determination of at least tentative answers to the following questions:

> Of the several variations, which appears to be the most effective "role-playing" technique currently used in industrial supervisory personnel training programs that would be most suitable for use in the experimental situation?
>
> What are the training techniques currently used in the leadership course of instruction at the troop school in which the experiment is to be conducted?
>
> What instrument(s) or method(s) are available for measuring or determining the general effectiveness of

the two types of training used in the experimental situation?

In the experimental situation, was the "role-playing" technique more effective than the currently used methods and techniques?

Definitions

Role-playing, as used herein, may be defined as a form of dramatic presentation or sketch in which the situations and "roles" are interpreted and "acted out" spontaneously or with a minimum of preparation by members of the trainee group. The sketch "is a fragment, a moment of life" (39). It is based on a leadership problem from the daily work situation that is known to members of the class or taken from the experience of one of the class but recognized as a real "problem" by others in the group (5). "Roles" are acted or played by members of the class with a minimum of preparation and no rehearsal of dialogue (11). The technique, as we shall see in Chapter II, is a variation of the "psychodrama" and "sociodrama." Role-playing, also called "role-taking," "experience practice," or "reality practice," as defined above and used in this study, resembles the "sociodrama" in structure and objective in that the various aspects of the problem are of primary importance while "the individual's personal relation to the situation is placed in the background"(25).

the new types of consumer need in the experimental situation?

In the experimental situation, are the "basic" psychic learning and activities that the consumer must mature and internalize?

Outline

Take-off-point, as used herein, may be defined as a form of consumer psychotherapy or counsel in which the attributes and traits are independent and "stand out" consciously in the a section of experiences by subject at the starting point. The study "is a beginning, a result of later life. It is based on a hypothesis problem from the really very elementary that is going to consider of the study or being from the experience of the of the times and involvement as a part "problem" by studying in the group (7). "Study" is taken as trying by subject to the place with a problem in psychotherapy and is responsible to problems (13). The hypothesis, as we shall see in chapter II, is a question of the "psychotherapy and treatment". Some physicians, also called "Psychiatrists" "Psychiatrist involves, or "reality problem" in medical school and used to help change, assuming that "treatment" in chemistry and relaxation in the life problem experts of the problem are of primary importance which "the individual's personal relation to the situation is placed in the foreground"(22).

Military training manuals on the subject of leadership appear to be incomplete without the phrase, "leadership is the art of influencing human behavior" (17) (64). The authors of these manuals are not alone in their prediliction for this phrase. Tead defines leadership more specifically but in similar phraseology when he states that it "is the activity of influencing people to co-operate towards some goal which they come to find desirable" (52). Others[1] have used very similar definitions applicable both to military and non-military leadership. However, the definition and scope of leadership for purposes of this study will be more limited than what could be referred to as "traditional" definitions. As used herein, leadership will refer to the supervision of military personnel in subordinate positions of authority and responsibility by the formal, necessarily authoritarian leader, in the non-tactical daily work situation where the leader deals with subordinates as individuals or in small groups. Tactical and combat leadership, therefore, are excluded by definition.

Jucius defines training as "any process by which the aptitudes, skills and abilities of employees to perform specific jobs is increased." He contrasts training with education by stating

---

[1] For example, Bureau of Naval Personnel and Training, Manual for Practical Development of Leadership Qualities, October 1944, p. 19; and L. A. Pennington, R. B. Hough and H. W. Case, The Psychology of Military Leadership, 1943, p. 102.

that "education is a process of increasing the knowledge, understanding or attitude of employees so that they are better adjusted to their working environment" (30). On the other hand, Hall[2] states that training may be defined as a process of assisting personnel -

> ....to gain effectiveness in their present or future work through the development of appropriate habits of thought and action, skills, knowledge and attitudes.

Military training, particularly formal training in leadership, is more general and all-inclusive than the Jucius definition will permit since it aims to increase the over-all effectiveness of individuals in order that the functional effectiveness of the organization may be increased. Therefore, while fully appreciating the distinction made by Jucius, the use of the word "training" in this study will be more general, including not only the development of "understanding" and "attitudes" in the personnel being trained by formal (i.e., classroom) methods. Thus, Hall's definition is considered more applicable to leadership training in a military situation.

Noncommissioned officers are the appointed leaders of "rank and file" military personnel and perform their leadership functions on the face-to-face levels of the military hierarchy. They are

---

[2] Employee Training in the Public Service, a report by a Civil Service Assembly Committee, Milton Hall, Chairman, Chicago, 1941, as quoted by Halsey (26).

frequently called "the backbone of any organization" (41) because of the role this group plays as small unit leader or assistant to the leader of larger units. Noncommissioned officers are concerned primarily with implementing orders and instructions transmitted from their immediate leaders and overseeing the activity of personnel under their supervision (62). Webster (65) defines a noncommissioned officer as "a subordinate officer appointed from the enlisted personnel....holding his rank by virtue of a warrant issued by an appointing officer, named by law."

Noncommissioned officers in the United States Marine Corps are denoted as follows: Corporal (third pay grade); Sergeant (fourth pay grade); Staff Sergeant (fifth pay grade); Technical Sergeant (sixth pay grade); Master Sergeant (seventh pay grade). The last three rank-groups are generally classified as staff noncommissioned officers.

Method and Locale

The initial paragraph of this chapter sets forth the scope or aims of the current study. However, a brief description of the method utilized in conducting the experiment and the locale are stated here in order that the reader will have an adequate overview of the order in which the study was made.

Initially, it was essential to establish the fact that "role-playing" or "experience practice" leadership training methods have been used with success in business and industry and then to select the particular technique or variation which appeared most suitable for use in a military leadership training situation. The preceding steps were taken after reading and analyzing the wealth of material on the subject in psychological, industrial and personnel management publications and reports.

The NCO Leaders' Course of the Second Marine Division, Fleet Marine Force, Camp Lejeune, N. C., was selected as the site of the experiment because it is a large, well-organized formal troop school. The Course functions under the cognizance of the Commanding General, Second Marine Division, and under the direct supervision of an Officer-in-Charge who is assisted by an instructional and administrative staff of eight officers and sixty enlisted personnel.

Arrangements were made with the Officer-in-Charge to use two classes (approximately 80 men each) in the experimental study. Fifty men in each of the two classes were paired or matched on the basis of scores made in a pre-exmperiment administration of a questionnaire on certain military leadership policies, practices and opinions. The initial, or "Control" class was given the standard classroom instruction in leadership by "conventional" methods and the second, or "Experimental" class, used the selected

role-playing technique. In addition, students in each of the classes completed very brief one page surveys after each of the classroom periods in which they rated the instruction as to applicability of subject matter to an NCO's every-day leadership problems, individual and group interest and level of student participation as evidenced by questions and discussions. After completion of the eight hours of formal instruction each of the groups was given a post-experiment administration of the questionnaire.

The effectiveness of the two techniques was then evaluated in terms of the measured changes in attitude resulting from the classroom instruction, student survey data and comments made by the instructional staff.

Need for Study

The Noncommissioned Officer of the Marine Corps almost invariably has proven to be a competent, courageous and highly successful leader of men in combat situations--and "the battle is the payoff" when it comes to evaluating tactical leadership training on any level. However, military leadership is not all "tactical leadership" of units in the field. The latter term, including as it does the most critical area of military leadership in general, actually embraces only a small percentage of the entire scope of noncommissioned leadership from the point of view of time alone. For example, the routine of camp and barracks life

with its seemingly endless series of administrative work and guard details and training periods, makes up the daily work situation wherein effective leadership, as it has been defined in this study, must be exercised by noncommissioned officers in order that the immediate, ever present, day-to-day work of the organization may be accomplished efficiently and effectively.

A brief examination of official correspondence and reports making reference to noncommissioned officer leadership performance in very recent years indicates, as shall be pointed out later, that the success of this group in tactical leadership has far exceeded their leadership performance as a group in the less hazardous and less glamorous, but also necessary, daily work situation.

One authority on the subject of leadership of a non-military nature states that "Success in performance is the ultimate criterion of success in training..." (52). Anyone familiar with the Armed Forces would hardly deny that this statement applies equally well to military leadership, yet if what has been implied is generally true--that the noncommissioned officer group in the Marine Corps is not performing its daily leadership function in the manner to be expected--then it would appear necessary to conclude that non-tactical leadership training of the post-war noncommissioned officer has not been as effective as it should have been.

As will be pointed out later in greater detail, such training normally is received through supervised guidance and experience "on-the-job" and by instruction in service and troop schools. In the latter situations, the training method used in the classroom has been generally confined to what might be termed "conventional" or "traditional" techniques such as the lecture, training film and, more recently, the conference or discussion. That such a practical and important aspect of the military profession continues to be presented in our schools by these methods seems strange when one considers the significant advances made during the past ten or 12 years in developing and using more realistic instructional methods in the area of tactics and techniques. This brings us to a consideration of the question--are there any more practical and realistic training techniques or methods available for use in the classroom leadership training situation?

The success, in many industrial organizations, of "role-playing" or "experience practice" techniques in developing and improving supervisory leadership on the foreman level of management indicates that perhaps such techniques would have similar success if used on the comparable military supervisory level of the noncommissioned officer leader. That this group is in need of more efficient and effective training procedures in non-

tactical leadership is apparent when an analysis is made of studies, official correspondence and reports making reference to a noncommissioned officer leadership as it has been defined. Colley, in a recent study, stated that too much emphasis has been given in the past to the significance of "technical and tactical activities in noncommissioned officer leadership and the training therefor," while, on the other hand, "too little attention has been paid to the non-tactical, personnel management and human relations activities inherent in that leadership" (emphasis added). This same writer concludes that good military leadership must have technical and tactical competence but at the same time "must also include a sound understanding and knowledge of the proper handling of men" (13).

In early 1950 the Marine Corps promulgated a significant order (58) reiterating the official policy of the Corps on the matter of personal leadership and the importance of "giving due consideration to the personal situation of each individual wearing its uniform."

Annual inspections conducted by the Inspector General of the Marine Corps in the recent past indicate an awareness of the general lack of competency in noncommissioned officer non-tactical leadership and further point up the need for improving old and developing new techniques in non-tactical leadership training. An examination of but a few of the official reports of inspections

completed during the past year, reveals several deficiencies in leadership as it has been defined for this study. For example, the official report (60) for one large installation indicates that "improvement in personal relations is desirable..." and that "some...noncommissioned officers are apparently failing to give adequate attention to the problems of the individual." The report indicates that the condition is by no means general but "apparently results from lack of realization of responsibility in this respect" on the part of the noncommissioned officers concerned. The presence of large numbers of Reserve noncommissioned officers, who lack practical experience in their current ranks (having been promoted while on inactive duty), or who found re-adjustment from civilian to military ways too difficult, has undoubtedly intensified the situation under discussion. This was noted in another report of inspection which points out that -

> Many of the NCO's are reserves whose primary concern is their return to civilian life and with pressing personal problems of their own they have little inclination to listen to the problems of subordinates.

This same report states that "noncommissioned officers are not supervising their subordinates to the desired degree nor are they concerning themselves with their [subordinates'] personal problems and other matters of welfare."

The problem of handling newly recruited personnel with inexperienced noncommissioned officers was commented on in another report of an inspection at a large Recruit Depot. That situation, "....directing the transition in a group of youths from relatively easy home living to the discipline of the service through leadership—not force," requires a drill instructor (noncommissioned officer) with "infinite patience and a high level of good judgment," according to the Inspector General's report (60).

A Senate Preparedness Subcommittee Report (56) on conditions at certain Navy and Marine Corps Training Centers recommended, among other things not directly pertinent to this study, that the Marine Corps take "immediate steps to improve morale by -

> Establishment of a realistic system whereby enlisted personnel may get a fair hearing for their grievances without fear of reprisals....

Without commenting on the factual accuracy of the report or the wisdom of the cited recommendation it should be apparent that any grievance procedure system in a large organization, civilian or military, depends for success on the degree of understanding and co-operation extended by the face-to-face leader or supervisor. As Roethlisberger (43) stated in discussing the daily face-to-face relationship of supervisor and subordinate in business and industry —

> ....only through them [face-to-face interactions] can the subordinate learn what is expected of him and where he stands. If in his relationship to his superior the

> subordinate feels insecure, dependent, and frustrated, no....manual can tell him where he belongs...

It would seem that the ultimate success of whatever system is in use depends in large measure on the co-operation and skill of the noncommissioned leader in implementing the system.

Although the Universal Military Training and Service Act (Public Law 51), as proposed by the National Security Training Commission has been defeated by vote in the 82nd Congress, it can be assumed that other proposals on this controversial project will be forthcoming in Congressional circles. Any proposal of the future will be essentially similar to the recently defeated bill in policies and standards having to do with the competence, quality and ability of both commissioned and noncommissioned trainer personnel. That this Commission (57) viewed the matter of leadership as a most vital factor in the UMT Program is apparent from the following --

> Our review of the successful Fort Knox Experiment .... convinced us that the key to.... responsible conduct on the part of trainees lies in the quality of their leaders. If the standards of the groups are to be raised, and then maintained at the new level, every element of the leadership must understand the standard and be convinced of its essential rightness....all officers, commissioned and noncommissioned unavoidably influence the character of the men under them by their words and their actions.... We therefore regard as matters of first importance....that all trainor personnel be thoroughly indoctrinated in the working philosophy of the program and acquainted with the particular problems of dealing with young men of eighteen.

The foregoing examples and citations, with the exception of that concerning Universal Militiary Training, provide ample evidence from past experience of the need for developing improved training techniques in leadership which will increase the effectiveness of the instruction presented in troop schools. The UMT citation serves only to emphasize the need for preparing now for possible requirements of the future.

Other Studies

Experimental field studies using role-playing as an educational or training technique have been conspicuous by their absence in the literature of educational psychology and industrial personnel training, although reports of the narrative and case study type have been noted. The effectiveness of role-playing in supervisory and leadership training, claimed by its advocates, appears to be a matter of subjective evaluation or opinion rather than the result of a more objective and scientific experimentation. Bradford (7) discusses"experience practice" sessions as a major, although preliminary, method in industrial supervisory training of the future. Bevelas (4) presents a subjective evaluation of role-playing in management training. He outlines its advantages and the developmental steps in a typical training session wherein the technique is used. His approach is pointed toward aiding course leaders or instructors in the use of the technique. Liveright (32) also outlines the various steps

or procedures in developing a role-playing leadership training session in industry and presents a more detailed discussion of advantages and disadvantages in using the technique. Tyler (55) reports a case study of the use of role-playing in a factory supervisors' training course. French (20), Lippett (33) and Broaded (10) discuss the theoretical aspects of role-playing and their application to leadership training in various fields. Graham (22) briefly reports the effect on students of using "sociodrama" in Wave officer training. The "effect" was determined by observation of student interest and enthusiasm in periods where the technique was used. Zander and Lippett (67) present an excellent discussion of the conduct of a role-playing or "reality practice" training situation while Zander's report (68) of a World War II Merchant Marine training program is particularly applicable to the current study because of the generally parallel circumstances.

Coleman (12) reports an experiment where role-playing was used in a college academic course. The experimental design included two groups and a pre- and post-test. Inadequate controls and relatively few role-playing sessions made his findings inconclusive except for "introspective data concerning the efficiency of this technique." Bowman's case study (6) in another college academic situation offers pertinent suggestions to the instructor inexperienced in using the technique. Grambs' report (23) of a

study in which the psychodramatic technique was used in a college-level course appears to be most extensive and complete. Three projective devices were used to measure changes in attitude and behavior, only one of which, a Problem Situation Test, provided reliable data according to the author.

So far as can be ascertained there have been no research studies or field experiments using role-playing or "psychodramatic" techniques in military leadership training situations.

Uses for Study

Expansion of the regular Marine Corps and possible further expansion in the event of another national emergency, as well as the possibility of a Universal Military Training Program, requires that noncommissioned officers be well-trained in both tactical and non-tactical leadership functions. That they are receiving the training required in technical and tactical areas is indicated by the success of the group as a whole in combat situations. However, the Section, "Need for Study," has amply indicated wherein current noncommissioned leadership has been deficient in certain man-management and human relations aspects of the non-tactical leadership function.

This study, modest in scope though it is, may be of use to units of the Fleet Marine Force as well as other organizations in which formal instruction or training in leadership is provided. For example, noncommissioned officer schools are conducted by

practically every unit the size of a battalion or squadron in the Fleet Marine Force and also by many large and small bases, stations and detachments throughout the Marine Corps. If the technique used in the experimental situation is successful, or even shows promise of success, it is reasonable to assume that role-playing as a technique in leadership training would merit further trial and experimentation in other units.

The study may be of possible use to responsible officers at the Educational Center, Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia, in suggesting improvements in the educational procedures used in the leadership courses of the several schools at Quantico. Officers at Headquarters, Marine Corps, responsible for preparing leadership training instructions and suggestions for use throughout the Marine Corps may also find this study of value.

Summary

It is believed that there is a demonstrated need for improving and developing the leadership skill of noncommissioned officers of the Marine Corps, especially in the man-management and human relations aspects of the leadership function in daily work situations. This can be accomplished, in part, by developing more effective types of learning experiences and more efficient training techniques for use in troop schools. In addition to the need for this study, it is believed that definite and immediate practical use can be made of important conclusions growing out of the study.

CHAPTER II

ROLE-PLAYING

Origin and Development

The terms role-playing, role-taking and experience or reality practice are variations of the "psychodrama" developed, if not originated, by an Austrian psychiatrist, Dr. J. L. Moreno. The actual origin of the "psychodrama" technique appears to be in dispute. Ansbacher (1) (2) holds that Simoneit, the scientific director of German military psychology prior to World War II, was the originator when he experimented with the situation test in the 1920's as a leader selection method. On the other hand, Moreno has countered with a spirited rebuttal to this idea, contending that he (Moreno) first used the technique in the treatment of mental cases in 1910 and that he actually coined the term "psychodrama." Moreno claims that his ideas were first published in Das Stegreiftheater in 1923 at Potsdam and that he brought the idea to America shortly thereafter where it was utilized in such diverse fields as "education, group work, community organization, psychological testing, psychotherapy, sociological research, co-operatives, business, industry and military schools" (38).

The "sociodrama," another variation of the original technique, has a fundamentally different purpose. Haas differentiates between the two techniques by stating --

> Psychodrama deals with a probelm in which a single individual or a group of individuals are privately involved. Whereas sociodrama deals with problems in which the collective aspects of the problem is [sic] put in the foreground, the individual's private relation is put in the background. The two cannot, of course, be neatly separated (25).

The first use of psycho-sociodrama techniques in other than mental diagnosis and therapy is not clear although we know the German military psychologists used a form of role-playing, the "situation test," in leader selection. The British Army also used a similar technique for the same purpose during World War II (27) as did the United States' Office of Strategic Services in screening agents for hazardous duty during the same period (29) (50). Inasmuch as this study is concerned with role-playing variations of the psycho-sociodrama technique and then only as a supervisory, management and leadership training method, no further effort or space will be devoted to enlarging on its applications in selection, education and other training situations.

Role-playing variations of the psycho-sociodramatic method have been used in the supervisory personnel (foremen) training programs of many large industrial organizations during the past eight or ten years. Its use in such programs has been almost exclusively in the human relations, man-management and leadership areas of industrial work supervision. Miller states that Moreno's Sociometric Institute first introduced role-playing applications in industrial situations in 1942. He further states that since its introduction, use of the technique "has spread through industry

and is now a part of many training programs" (37). Longenecker reports a study (34) in which ten organizations[1] responded to inquiries concerning their utilization and opinion of role-playing as a training method. Practically all of the information derived came from companies who found role-playing a "successful method of training" although he indicates that the number of companies using the technique appeared relatively "small" and that using companies had rather "elaborate training programs."

Reports[2] in professional and personnel management publications describe the use of role-playing (reality practice, experience practice, etc.) in personnel training programs and discuss applications of the technique in several industrial training situations.

The Technique Used in Experiment

In order to determine the exact form of role-playing to use in the experimental situation, it was necessary to select or develop one that would be most suitable in view of the large number of students in the Experimental Class. This was accomplished

---

[1] Companies reporting the use of role-playing as a training technique included, for example, the Armstrong Cork Company, Lancaster, Pa.; Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York; General Electric Co., Schnectady, N. Y., and Thompson Products, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

[2] For example, "Role-Playing in Leadership Training," A.A. Liveright, Personnel Journal, April, 1951, p. 412-416; "Role-Playing in Supervisory Training," Leland P. Bradford and Ronald Lippitt, Personnel, May, 1946, p. 358-369; "Role-Playing as a Method of Training Foremen," John R. P. French, Sociometry, p. 410-425.

by reviewing and analyzing many of the reports and articles published in management, personnel and psychological periodicals on role-playing, experience practice, or reality practice as a supervisory or leadership training technique. A pattern or sequence of steps was developed from the analysis and used as a guide by the regularly assigned instructor for the role-playing sessions in the experimental situation.

During the course of the review of literature it became apparent that variations of role-playing may be divided into two general classifications according to the aim or purpose of the training program within which they were used. In the first category are those variations which permit a group of foremen or supervisors to practice new methods or techniques in human relations or in handling personnel problems such as grievances, complaints, layoffs, etc. In such training situations the emphasis would be on practice and development of specific skills. Training groups would be necessarily small for the role-playing to be at all successful. In the second category are those variations which are used with large groups where the main purpose is to concentrate on developing insight and changing attitudes rather than allowing the trainee to "practice" specific leadership skills. In the experiment, limited classroom facilities and a very tight schedule of classes made it impractical to subdivide the eighty man class groups into smaller sections for the role-playing leadership sessions. It was necessary, therefore,

to limit the objective of the experiment to that of the latter category, i. e., "developing insight and changing attitudes." This was done on the assumption that a significant improvement or change in attitude toward leadership methods, practices and opinions would have a beneficial effect on student noncommissioned officer behavior on the job after completion of the Leaders' Course.

As previously indicated, the review and analysis of available literature on the subject permitted the development of steps or phases for use as a guide to the instructor. The ten steps finally used are summarized below. They were derived principally from a pamphlet on role-playing by Argyris (3) and articles on the subject by Bradford and Lippitt (8), French (20), Lippitt (33), Zander (68) and Zander and Lippitt (67). The steps are —

FIRST - The Instructor sensitizes the group to its leadership needs and discusses the value of the common experience.

SECOND-The Instructor encourages suggestions from the class on specific leadership problems as they have experienced them. Thus, the group is "warmed-up" for the role-playing to follow (14).

THIRD - One of the "problems" is selected by the group (or instructor) to be dramatized or "acted out" by several members of the class. In some instances, it is advisable to pre-select one or all actor-participants in order that they may become more thoroughly familiar with a particular problem or situation. However, no rehearsal of lines should be permitted as a spontaneous approach is essential.

FOURTH - The Instructor defines the problem situation and roles for the participants so that the sketch does not become a "battle of imaginations."

FIFTH - The Instructor assists the group to observe intelligently by emphasizing the central idea in the sketch and suggesting that the class note anything they believe to be significant as the sketch develops.

SIXTH - The situation is enacted by the actor-participants and the remainder of the group observes.

SEVENTH - The Instructor "cuts" the action immediately after the climax or when he feels the sketch has accomplished its purpose.

EIGHTH - The Instructor initiates the discussion phase by allowing the actor-participants to comment first (in order that they may make the first opportunity to point out their mistakes) and contributes "expert" opinions or comments when and where such appear to be desirable.

NINTH - Roles are re-played by other members of the class applying suggestions brought out in the discussion phase. (This step is optional with the instructor who is in the best position to decide if such a procedure appears desirable.)

TENTH - The Instructor summarizes the major points illustrated by the sketch and brought out in the subsequent discussion.

It was believed that this technique of leadership instruction would allow members of the experimental group to gain a more vivid and clear insight into everyday problems of NCO leaders and would effect a measurable change in the attitudes of non-participants as well as the actor-participants (who, in this experiment, were relatively few in number). This was based on

the findings of an earlier similar study in a civilian educational situation in which it was found that, although only a few of the class took part in the "psychodrama" (role-playing), the audience also "learned" because "the warming up process or preparation of the class.... creates a tension and alertness in all members." The author, in discussing the effect of observing a role-playing sketch, continues --

> ....the group is alert to clues as to what is or will be appropriate behavior, and more ready to accept ideas than in almost any other learning situation. The effect on the audience continues while the [role-playing] is going on. Casual observation of an audience witnessing .... [role-playing] demonstrates that they are involved in the action....its dramatic qualities allow for the greatest possible identification with the actors... the participants are friends and acquaintances, so what happens to them is of more concern that it would be to strangers....(23).

Thus it can be seen that the vicarious involvement of the non-participating trainees tends to affect their learning processes but to a somewhat lesser extent than the actor-participants.

Advantages and Limitations

The role-playing technique used in this study is not advocated as a panacea for the leadership training ills of the Marine Corps. Role-playing like all other instructional methods and techniques, has certain advantages and disadvantages. While it is not within the purpose of this study to discuss them at length it is considered

advisable and necessary at this point briefly to review several of the more important advantages in using the technique as well as the more significant limitations. This summary review is based on information outlined in articles by individuals experienced in the use of the technique in a variety of situations, including industrial supervisory training programs, and is drawn principally from Liveright (32), French (20), Bavelas (4), Lippitt (33), Zander and Lippitt (67) and Hoslett (28).

One of the principal advantages in the use of role-playing is that the situation is made vivid and concrete by having members of the trainee group "act out" the specific problem. In this way verbal and visual symbols used in discussion give way initially to "live" material which, in terms of Dale's "Cone of Experience," more closely approaches the direct, purposeful experience of real life. He suggests that dramatization by participation and observation assists in getting "as close as possible to certain realities that we cannot reach firsthand" (16). By means of problem dramatization, all members of the trainee group have a common "starting point" in the discussion which follows and the gap is bridged between an abstract leadership situation and a "life-like" situation.

The instructor, assisted by discussion from the class, is in a position to commend desirable behavior as well as criticize poor leadership behavior in a specific situation. By providing an immediate correction of errors and reinforcement of desired

behavior an accepted principle of sound educational method is observed wherein the observers as well as the actor-participants benefit.

A third notable advantage is that role-playing sessions are a more efficient and economical method than "on-the-job" training which is a primary method in the leadership training of non-commissioned officers. As French points out, "....role-playing is efficient because it can accomplish with a whole group at the same time what would otherwise have to be done individually."

The trainees are sensitized to a variety of leadership techniques in role-playing classes, especially when a single problem is "acted out" with different individuals in the leader role. This variation of the technique quickly demonstrates to the group that there are various ways of handling a particular problem and that no two individuals in the leader's role will function in identical ways. Similarly, it is possible for the group to have an immediate knowledge of results obtained by the "leader" which cannot be obtained in a conference or discussion period where the class uses a purely verbal approach to the problem.

The instructor who uses role-playing is able to develop "an active, creative group because it requires participation of the group in a way which ties in with their own important problems" (20). Also, the technique assists in developing insight among the trainee group into common problems in the supervision of

subordinate personnel who also have motives, problems and attitudes which must be considered by the formal, appointed leader.

Besides sensitizing trainees to the variety of solutions in a given problem as described above, role-playing also sensitizes the group, as individuals, to the effects of the "leader's" action on his subordinates, or followers, because members of the group act in these roles and are in a position to describe their thoughts and reactions during the discussion period following the role-playing sketch. In short, the individual becomes sensitized to the effects of his actions on his men.

Another major advantage to role-playing is that the instructor has "control of the social environment beyond the training class" and can illustrate a great variety of leader-follower interpersonal problems--past, present, and future--merely by defining the situations and roles for the trainee group (20).

Most of the literature reviewed tends to emphasize the advantages and possibilities of role-playing and either "plays down" or ignores the more important of its limitations and disadvantages. Generally speaking, these fall into two categories; first, those arising chiefly from the skill and experience of the instructor, and second, those growing out of the ego-defensiveness and resistance to change of the trainee group. The weaknesses of the latter can be eliminated or neutralized somewhat by particularly effective instructional leadership.

The instructor, to be effective, must be imaginative, enthusiastic, resourceful and flexible, "seising upon suggestions, seeing the potentialities in the dramatizations, utilizing the best talent in the group for the purpose at hand" (6). As one authority has stated -- "lectures, group discussion, role-playing can be regarded as being on a continuum along which the skill of the instructor is increasingly important" (4). How to develop skill in the use of role-playing as an instructional aid is answered directly in two sources, each of which indicates that effective use of the technique can best be learned through the simple expedient of "use and practice" (67) (4).

Disadvantages arising out of the ego-defensiveness of the trainee group are usually, although not always, traceable to faulty or inadequate "warming up" of the audience for role-playing during which phase the interest of the group is awakened and individual memories are stirred (14). Bradford and Sheats (9) describe the "resistance to change" in trainees in five areas which can be summarized as--

1. Trainee has "vested interest" in his old form of behavior. He must be shown that the change will improve his position.

2. Trainee has no experience with proposed change in behavior.

3. Trainee has an inadequate perception of the total problem. He never sees the "other side of the picture" and therefore sees no need for learning a better way.

4. Trainee has a "status quo" smugness or satisfaction with his present level of performance.

5. Trainee resists change because of insecurity. The proposed form of behavior presents a greater chance of failure than old or present form of behavior.

CHAPTER III

THE NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICER LEADER'S COURSE

Introduction

Individual training of enlisted men in the United States Marine Corps is based on instructions in the Marine Corps Manual and Marine Corps General Order No. 62, "Individual Training of Enlisted Men." The general objective of all training, as stated in the latter reference, is —

> ....to develop pride and self-confidence, discipline, physical fitness, technical proficiency, initiative, adaptability to varied conditions in the field, leadership, teamwork, and tactical proficiency in the individual....

Within the scope of the over-all goal of training is the primary objective of noncommissioned officer training which is —

> ....to develop the leadership and command potential of the noncommissioned officers by instruction and supervised guidance in the performance of their duties as leaders and instructors (59).

As implied in the foregoing citation and stated in the Marine Corps Manual, the principal agencies for training noncommissioned officers are "on-the-job training and the schools conducted by post and unit commanders" (61).

The Leadership Course of the 2nd Marine Division, Fleet Marine Force, Camp Lejeune, N. C., is a troop school established by the Commanding General in accordance with the cited instructions (which are applicable to all organizations of the Corps) and

certain other directives of a classified nature from the Commandant to the Commanding Generals of the Fleet Marine Forces, Atlantic[1] and Pacific. These directives on training to be conducted in FMF units stress, in part, the importance of developing non-commissioned leaders and the necessity for troop schools wherein leadership instruction is emphasized.

The Division Leadership Course, established by a Training Order (45) seeks --

> To provide training for Noncommissioned Officers to better equip them for present billets and to increase their qualifications for promotion and leadership ability.

The Course is of three weeks duration and is directed by an Officer-in-Charge who is assisted by an instructional and administrative staff of eight commissioned officers and 60 enlisted personnel. Each class consists of approximately eighty noncommissioned officers of all ranks who are detailed to attend the course from the various units of the Division. The classes, therefore, are made up of students with heterogenous backgrounds in military occupation, rank, and length of service. Each class is considered as a "student company" and is divided into two or more platoons. Classes commence training each Monday so that there are three classes in residence at all times.

---

[1] The Second Marine Division is a major component of the Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic, which has its headquarters at Norfolk, Virginia.

[illegible] [illegible] of a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Curriculum

The course curriculum (44) consists of a total of one hundred sixty-three hours of formal instruction divided into five sub-courses as indicated in Table I.

TABLE I

COURSE CURRICULUM

	Sub-course	Day	Night	Total Hours
I	Professional Indoctrination	$15\frac{1}{2}$		$15\frac{1}{2}$
II	Weapons	31		31
III	Individual Combat Training	30	6	36
IV	Basic Tactics	54	17	71
V	Technique of Military Instruction	$9\frac{1}{2}$		$9\frac{1}{2}$
	TOTAL HOURS	140	23	163

Sub-course I consists of $10\frac{1}{2}$ hours classroom instruction in "Leadership" and five hours in "Drills and Ceremonies" presented by various training methods. Table II summarized the leadership subjects, number of hours allotted to each topic and the methods of instruction used during each period. This experiment was conducted during the first eight hours (1st, 2nd, 3rd and

4th periods) of the instruction.

TABLE II

PROFESSIONAL INDOCTRINATION

Period	Method	Subject	Hours
Leadership			
1st	Lecture-Conference	"The Noncommissioned Officer"	2
2nd	Lecture-Conference	"Tools of Leadership"	1
3rd	Lecture-Training Film	"Technique of Leadership"	1
4th	Conference	"Practical Leadership Problems"	4
5th	Practical Exercise	"Commands and General Presence"	2
6th	Examination	"Leadership"	1/2
Drills and Ceremonies			
1st	Lecture, Demonstration, Practical Exercise	"Formal Guard Mount"	2
2nd	Inspections		3

1st Period - "The Noncommissioned Officer"
Lecture and Conference - 2 hours

1. Introduction
Need for leadership in the Marine Corps, in units, by individual Marines; how leadership needs are met.

2. The Noncommissioned Officer
Who the Noncommissioned Officer is; chain of command; place of NCO in chain of command; supervisory function of the NCO; the NCO as a link between the Commander and the troops; the NCO's Certificate of Appointment; his authority; his responsibilities -- to his men, his organization, the Marine Corps, his country.

2nd Period - "Tools of Leadership"
Lecture and Conference - 1 hour

1. General
Leadership can be learned.

2. Terms
The tools of leadership are described by abstract terms like "tact," "fairness," "decisiveness," etc.; with added experience the use of leadership tools and techniques will become easier.

3. Characteristics of the Leader
Can be discussed under general headings of attitude, performance of duty and intelligence; a leader may make mistakes but they should not be foolish mistakes; same mistakes should not be made twice.

4. Specific Factors in Military Leadership
Texts on military leadership list various factors; headings and number vary but the discussion is fairly consistent; discussion of factors such as physical fitness, bearing and neatness, attention to duty, knowledge of profession, co-operation, tact, initiative, judgment and common sense, justice, force, courage, decisiveness, loyalty and enthusiasm.

3rd Period - "Technique of Leadership"
Lecture and Training Film - 1 hour

1. General
   Need for organization; the importance of the mission; organization of work; training commands and orders.

2. Co-operation
   Co-operation by example; based on knowledge and confidence in leader; NCO's responsibility for co-operation; limitation of rewards and punishments; unit pride and loyalty; recognition of the individual Marine.

3. Military Discipline
   Definition; necessity for self-discipline; reprimands and punishment; firmness and consistency; group punishment; support of subordinate leaders; security; recognition.

4. Personal Relations
   With subordinates; with seniors.

5. Developing Leadership
   Need for self-examination and self-criticism; seeking and accepting leadership opportunities; need for experience and practice.

6. Army Ground Forces Training Film
   21-2056 (RESTRICTED) "By Your Command."

4th Period - "Practical Leadership Problems"
Conference - 4 hours

This period, made up of two 2 hour class sessions, is devoted to instructor-led discussions of solutions to a series of six leadership problems, all but one of which are in the area of "leadership" as defined in this study; that is, problems of a supervisory or human relations nature involving a noncommissioned officer leader and either one subordinate or a small group of subordinates.

The problem situations are "packaged" recordings[2] which depict actual and fictitious examples of leadership problems.

---

2 Due to the lack of a record-playing instrument at the Leadership Course, it was necessary to use a script of the problem situations to be read by the instructor or one of the student NCO's. This artificialty probably reduced the total effectiveness of this method of instruction as the recordings were complete with background sound effects.

At the end of each sketch the instructor calls on individual students for recommended solutions or comments. The recordings, or, in this instance, the instructor-read situations are specific problems designed to illustrate several leadership principles and techniques. Titles of the situations are —

1. "When Sergeant Socks Sergeant"
2. "Rifle Inspection"
3. "The Case of the Senior Sergeant"
4. "Derogatory Remarks"
5. "The Foxhole Digger"
6. "72"

Summary

Eight hours of the Sub-course on "Professional Indoctrination" in the NCO Leadership Course is used to present "Leadership" instructions to regular classes. Methods utilized in this instruction include the conventional lecture, conference and training film wherein the students are presented organized facts, information and principles on leadership for noncommissioned officers. The instruction is of a "packaged" type yet also permits the instructor and students an opportunity to discuss the material in order to clarify points in question.

CHAPTER IV

THE EXPERIMENT

Introduction

In early February, 1952, the writer conferred with the Officer-in-Charge[1] of the Leadership Course and worked out the details of this Experiment. At that time, the 5th and 6th Classes were selected as the "Control" and "Experimental" classes, the role-playing technique to be used was discussed, and certain background of information about the Course obtained from responsible officers of the Division. In addition, the methodology was outlined and arrangements were made to administer the Opinionaire to the two classes before commencing Sub-course I and again after the eight hour classroom leadership instruction had been completed. Information exchanged during the February conference was supplemented later and during the course of the experiment by night letters and mail correspondence.[2] Communication and understanding between the writer and the Officer-in-Charge was satisfactory throughout, considering the distance separating the two. Certain changes in original plans were made by the Officer-in-Charge because of exigencies at the Leadership Course but, with one exception, were minor in nature. The significant exception was an eleventh-hour change in the instructor for the Experimental Class. Original plans called for the same officer to teach both

[1] John Mesko, Major, U. S. Marine Corps.

[2] Correspondence will be referred to hereafter by date and name of writer.

classes. However, unforseeable developments necessitated the assignment of a new instructor[3] to teach the Experimental Class using the experimental role-playing method described in Chapter II. The new instructor, although inexperienced, was familiar with the technique as an educational method although not in its actual use. He carried through the experiment with only minor deviations from the original plans.

Experimental Design

A decision made early in the planning stages of the study called for an experimental design of the familiar Control-Experimental Group type with paired individuals. This decision was made because of the well-known advantages in such a procedure (18) (35). Determination of a relevant variable to be used as a basis for pairing individuals was the major question to be answered at that point. Several possibilities were available in this situation. For example, general intelligence as evidenced by General Classification Test Scores, length of service, age, military occupational specialty (infantry, artillery, administrative, food service, motor transport, armored vehicle, etc.). However, since the dependent variable in the experimental situation concerned changing and developing attitudes of individuals toward

---

[3] Edward Feigan, 2nd Lieutenant, U. S. Marine Corps.

Clausen. However, individuals frequently overestimated the
applicability of a law [illegible] to the experimental [illegible]
and in the experimental relationship versus descriptive in character
[illegible]. The new [illegible], although [illegible], was limited
with the exception of a [illegible] method although not in its
actual use. It varied through the experiment with only minor
deviations from the original plans.

Experimental Design

A baseline case study in the planning stages of the study
called for an experimental design of the Solomon [illegible]-
Experimental Group type with paired individuals. This design
was made known at the well-known disadvantage in such a procedure
(24) (25). Determination of a relevant variable to be used as
a basis for pairing individuals and the major question to be
answered at that point. Several possibilities were available in
this situation. The variable, general intelligence as evidenced by
General Classification Test scores, length of service, age,
military occupational specialty (jobbing), availability, administrative
load service, order [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]. However,
since the dependent variable is the experimental attempting com-
mental maturity and leadership attitudes of individuals toward

---

[illegible] Theory, and Implications, p. 5. [illegible] [illegible].

military leadership practices, opinions and methods, it was believed that an independent measuring instrument, such as an achievement test, would be a more appropriate and accurate basis for pairing individuals. Accordingly, it was decided to use the post-experiment measuring instrument for this purpose by a pre-experiment administration of the test.

In diagram form the design is identical to Stouffer's illustrative diagram of a model design (see Figure 1) for controlled experiments (48). While Payne does not agree that this is necessarily the "ideal" model for "investigations of opinion and idea formation" (40), its use in this study is believed to be warranted in view of the objective, subjects available and locale of the experiment. Also, the design incorporates the elements considered by Krech and Crutchfield (31) to be necessary in a study of changes in attitude.

FIGURE 1

DIAGRAM OF DESIGN

	Before	After	
Experimental Group	x 1	x 2	d x 2 - x 1
Control Group	x'1	x'2	d x'2 - x'1

Measuring Instruments

In discussing the two purposes of the present study, a basic question was posed as follows:

> What instrument(s) or method(s) are available for measuring or determining the general effectiveness of the two types of training used in the experimental situation?

It was stated then that "tentative answers" would be obtained for this, and certain other basic questions. However, a review of the literature on attitude-opinion research in the Armed Forces, especially that accomplished during World War II, revealed nothing previously used that would be suitable in this study. Accordingly, it was necessary to construct an instrument for measuring attitude toward military leadership of a non-tactical nature. In reviewing various tests and measuring instruments for ideas as to form and content, the writer encountered the File and Remmers' Opinionaire, "How Supervise?" (19), which was designed to be used in industrial supervisory areas. It appeared that an instrument of this type offered the best possibilities for use in the experimental situation although considerable adaptation would be necessary to make it applicable to military leadership practices. Using the instrument as a model, the writer revised the items to fit a military supervisory or non-tactical leadership situation or developed new items from military training publications (17) (62) and the unpublished article by Colley (13) in which a "General

Job Description for Core Activities of Noncommissioned Officers in the Infantry Functional Field" had been developed.

The final product consisted of 100 items with three response selections and sub-divided into three sections titled "Policies," "Practices" and "Opinions." It was designed as a non-speed test and its primary purpose was to measure the single general factor of attitude toward military leadership practices, methods, and opinions as indicated by the verbalized opinions of trainees.

In addition to the item sections, there was included an information data sheet on which each subject was asked to write in such basic information as Name, Rank, Military Occupational Speciality Number, Age and Date. Also, each subject was asked to indicate certain other information as -- "Have you ever taken a Noncommissioned Officers' Training course?, Where?, When?, Number of men working directly under your direction in your last assignment before entering this course. Education, and General Classification Test Score. Although actually not used this information was obtained for possible assistance in pairing individuals in the Control and Experimental Groups. A copy of the instrument is included as Appendix I.

A basic assumption in the use of the instrument was that the opinion technique, measuring purely verbal responses, provided a sound, although not perfect, measure of basic attitudes and, ultimately, behavior in the area under study. As Stagner points

out, "There are numerous indications that opinions are more than mere verbalizations, that they are also predictive of behavior." In support of this statement he cites studies by Porter and Neumann to demonstrate "that verbal and overt behavior cannot be sharply separated" (47).

The answer key used to determine relative scores among the trainee subjects was arrived at by an administration of the Opinionaire to ten members of the instructional staff in the Leadership Course. A simple four-fifths majority response on an item was used as the criterion for acceptance as the "most correct" response. Only four items (Numbers 22, 35, 37 and 70) failed to produce a majority response from the ten "judges." There was no "uncertain" (that is, "?") responses in the key.

A thorough preliminary test run and analysis of results to determine the validity and reliability of the instrument was not practical due to time and distance factors. Nevertheless, establishment of reliability and validity coefficients from data available in the experiment appeared to be necessary in view of McNemar's criticism of the use of attitude tests of unproven validity (35). In order to establish at least a tentative realibility coefficient, the response sheets of 35 randomly selected members of the 5th Class (Control) were analyzed to determine a "co-efficient of equivalence" and to arrive at answers to the following questions:

and, "There are numerous situations that opinions are more than mere verbalizations, that they are also predictive of behavior." In support of this statement, he cites another by Porter and Lawler in Managerial Psychology that "what people say matters because it usually approximates what they do".

The answer may lead to functional relative scores among the trained subjects but reveal a lack in association of the dependability to the members of the instructional staff in the laboratory course. A single item-criterion adjusting regression as then was used as the criterion for assessment of the "best answer" response. Only four items (Members 21, 30, 37 and 70) failed to produce a significant regression term like the "judge." There was no "nonsensical" item (item 14, "7") responded to the key.

A thorough preliminary item and scale analysis of reading to determine the validity and reliability of the instrument was not practical due to time and logistical factors. Nevertheless, satisfactory of reliability and validity concerning item data available in the literature appeared to be necessary in view of necessary artifacts of the use of attitude scale of supposed validity (30). In order to establish at least a tentative validity criterion, the response sheets of 32 randomly selected members of the Three (Cadets) were analyzed to determine a "re-efficient of activities" and to arrive at answers to the following questions:

(1) How precisely does the test measure?
(2) How adequately does it sample all the items that might be included?

A coefficient of .71003 resulted from the use of the Kuder-Richardson formula (Case III)[4] and, in view of the conservative nature of the method, is considered satisfactory for purposes of the study. The Opinionaire, although designed to measure a single general factor, actually might very well "cover many different abilities" making the "estimate from this formula....low, sometimes much too low" (15).

Establishing the validity of the instrument was quite another problem and not nearly as simple and clear-cut because of the difficulty in finding suitable criteria. However, the limited purpose of the test — to determine the subject's attitude as indicated by his verbalized opinion — as Cronbach states, gives the opinion test a high degree of validity "by definition." During the progress of the February conference with the Officer-in-Charge, it was indicated that the instrument appeared to have a high degree of "face" validity—an important consideration in obtaining the co-operation and interest of the subjects being tested. This was borne out when the staff completed the test to provide data for the answer key. Also, these responsible individuals indicated that the test was usable as a general achievement test in leadership and therefore had acceptability from the viewpoint of

---

[4] $r = \frac{n}{n-1}\left(1-\frac{PQ}{S^2}\right)$ as illustrated in Cronbach (15).

"curricular validity."

However, these manifestations do not clearly establish the validity of the instrument as compared with a suitable outside criterion. A "suitable criterion," in this instance, would appear to be the behavioral effectiveness of the subjects as leaders in their respective billets. To determine this, it would be necessary to wait until the trainees returned to their respective units and obtain ratings or observations on their leadership effectiveness as noncommissioned officers. This would be an intermediate or ultimate type criterion and was manifestly impractical in this study. However, an immediate criterion for determining the validity of the test as a predictor of success was found in the final class standings computed by the staff on the basis of examination marks and staff observations and ratings of students' field work (46). While this criterion is relatively "impure" since it includes certain other factors not measured or intended to be measured by the Opinionaire, it does afford an adequate yardstick for comparing the test results with final ranking of the NCO trainees by the Course staff since the latter is, in effect, an expert opinion of the relative leadership effectiveness of the trainee as evidenced by their over-all performance in the course. Therefore, if our initial assumption borrowed from Stagner, is accepted--that opinions are "predictive of behavior"--there is good reason for believing that the Opinionaire results should have a predictive relationship to the criterion

In order to determine the validity of the instrument as a measure of success in the Leadership Course, final standing[5] for the 5th and 6th Classes were obtained and the fifty pairs of individuals in the Control and Experimental Groups were arranged in rank-order according to the standings in their respective classes. These standings were compared with the relative standings of the same subjects based on their scores in the pre-and post-experiment administration of the test. The rank-difference correlation coefficients (rho)[6] obtained are summarized in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2

RANK-DIFFERENCE CORRELATION

	5th Class Control	6th Class Experimental
Pre	.374	.38
Post	.759	.43

The coefficients, while relatively low (with the exception of the Post-Test for the Control Group) are considered acceptable for this study in view of Cronbach's remarks concerning the range of the group being studied. He pointed out that the correlation

---

[5] Mesko, 26 March, 1952.

[6] $\text{rho} = 1 - \frac{6 \sum D^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$

In order to determine the validity of the instrument as a measure of success in the laboratory course, final standings for the 5th and 6th classes were obtained and the fifty pairs of laboratory in the control and experimental groups were arranged in rank-order according to the standings in their respective classes. These standings were compared with the achievement standings of the same subjects based on their scores on the general chemistry achievement examination. The rank-difference correlation coefficients (rho)[6] obtained are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

RANK-DIFFERENCE CORRELATIONS

	5th Class (Control)	6th Class (Experimental)
Rho	.278	.32
Sig.	.127	.02

The coefficients, while relatively low (with the exception of the coefficient for the control group) are considered significant for this study in view of Cronbach's remarks concerning the range of the final grade standard. He stated on that the correlation

[6] Siegel, op. cit., 202.

[6] $rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum D^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$

"is smaller in a selected group than in a group containing a wider range of ability" (15). The noncommissioned officers in this course supposedly have been pre-selected in the normal promotion process during which those men of very poor judgment and leadership ability were eliminated, i.e., not promoted. Also, the positive correlations obtained compared very favorably with examples given by Cronbach of validity coefficients of various sizes obtained on a variety of tests and criteria. Among the several given, the test, "How Supervise?" correlated .18 with rating of success among 40 pre-selected factory supervisors.

In addition to the opinion-attitude measuring instrument described, students in each group were asked to complete one-page surveys at the end of each classroom session during the course of the experiment. The Survey items were intended and designed to gauge the opinion of the students of the particular method of instruction used by the instructor during that session, their opinion of the applicability of the subject matter to their everyday problems, and their opinion concerning the degree of interest engendered in the class by the method of instruction. This method was adopted because it was believed that the trainees themselves were in an eminently favorable position to rate the effectiveness of the two methods of instruction. As one group of authorities (49) has pointed out, "what the men think about their training...may not correspond to the judgment of experts; but it is real to the men themselves." The authors observe that "Learning

is conditioned by the students' opinions and attitudes with regard to the importance and probable usefulness of the material, by his interest in the material...." and that the student is in a "uniquely favored position to look back on his training in the light of the duties he has....to perform."

The device used was the "graphic rating scale" in which a straight horizontal line was drawn to represent the continuum in question. Descriptive terms were included under the line from one extreme to the other (left to right). The scale was employed because it represented a simple, easily understood method whereby untrained rating personnel could easily and quickly indicate their opinion of the items in question (21) (24). The lines were six inches in length and a previously marked stencil divided into 64 equal units, was used to obtain quantitative scores on each item marked by the trainees. In this way, totals and averages could be obtained and the two methods of instruction compared on the basis of item mean scores and method mean scores. A copy of the survey instrument is included in Appendix II.

Conduct of Experiment

The experimental phases of the study were conducted during the period 18 February - 14 March, 1952. Members of each class completed the Opiniomaire on the initial day of the course; the post-experiment administration took place during the third week after the classroom instruction in leadership was finished.

Pairing one hundred individuals in the two classes resulted in remarkably similar groups when compared on the basis of age, rank and length of service. The Control Group's average age was 22 1/2 years and the Experimental Group averaged 22 1/4 years in age. The average Control subject's rank was Sergeant with three years and eight months service as compared with the experimental subject's average rank of Sergeant with three years and seven months service.

The Control Class received their instruction during the period 18 February - 7 March and the Experimental Class during the period 25 February - 14 March. Instruction for the Control Class was presented in the conventional manner described in Chapter III. The Instructor for the Experimental Group, deviating from the original plans, used the initial period for an introductory talk on "Noncommissioned Officer Leadership" and then, with the assistance of the class, discussed leadership problems on the NCO level in preparation for the three sessions which were to follow. Role-playing techniques and discussions of the sketches presented were used in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th periods (total of six hours), following the general pattern of steps outlined in Chapter II of this study. Although only a total of five-role-playing sketches were presented, the limited number engendered considerable discussion by students in the Experimental Class. One of the dramatized situations is summarized below.[7]

[7] Summarized from Feigan, 28 February, 1952.

Problem - Supervision of Reserve personnel awaiting separation and return to inactive duty. Characters included a regular Marine Staff Sergeant and a Reserve Marine Sergeant awaiting separation in 90 days.

The situation revolved around the failure of the Sergeant to maintain his vehicles in satisfactory condition. The Staff Sergeant inquires about this condition and instructs the Reserve Sergeant to "square away" the vehicles.

This, and the other sketches, were presented spontaneously by the "role-players" and were followed immediately by a discussion among members of the class, including the actor-participants. Role-playing actually took place in the experimental situation, because as Argyris points out (3) --

> ....we may say that role-playing happens when a group of some sort watches a group of its fellow members enact their roles (or someone else's) in a skit based on some real life situation. All members of the group, including the actors, then talk about the skit and try to analyse it.

At the end of each regular period of instruction in both Groups, students made out the Surveys previously described. On completion of the final period of instruction in each class, the post-experiment administration of the Opinionaire was accomplished and results forwarded to the writer by mail (as all previous data had been handled) for tabulation of results.

The pre- and post-experiment administrations of the attitude measuring instrument provided a total of fifty-three pairs of scores in the two classes. The discrepancy between the total number in the class and the number of pairs derived was caused by the failure of several students in each class to take either

the pre- or post- test and inability to match certain scores. Pairing was accomplished on the basis of exact scores or with a maximum variance of two points between individuals in a pair. The number of pairs was then reduced to fifty for convenience in handling by randomly selecting out one pair in the upper, middle and lower thirds of the original fifty-three pair distribution.

Results

The 5th Class (Control) mean score on the pre-test was 68.6 as compared with a post-test score of 69.6 or an average gain per subject of only .02 points. The 6th Class (Experimental) mean score on the pre-test was 69.3 and on the post-experiment test increased to 75.5 or an average gain of .118 points per man. Net gain for the Control Group was 47 points and for the Experimental Group was 308 points. Therefore, the difference in total gain between the two groups was 261 points in favor of the experimental or role-playing method over the conventional method of instruction, or an average gain per subject of 5.22 points. Table III summarizes the essential data derived from computations which were based on a parallel problem situation (66). The Critical Ratio, .931, when corrected for restricted degree of freedom,[8] becomes 1.17.

---

[8]

$$t = \frac{M_A - M_B}{\sqrt{(\sigma^2_{M_A} + \sigma^2_{M_B})(1 - r^2_{AB})}}$$

TABLE III

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS COMPOSED OF MATCHED PAIRS

	Control (A) 5th Class	Experimental (B) 6th Class
N	50	50
Mean (Pre)	68.6	69.3
Mean (Post)	69.6	75.5
σ	41.9	43.7
σ_M	5.99	6.27
rAB	.55	
Diff M_{AB}	5.4	
σ Diff M_{AB}	5.8	
Critical Ratio	1.17	

Was the gain, or difference between the two post-experiment means significant or was it due in large part to the operation of chance? By setting the null hypothesis the statistical significance of the difference may be tested. On the basis of the data derived, the null hypothesis must be accepted with the conclusion that the role-playing method was <u>not</u> significant in causing the improved attitude toward military leadership and that the chance factor

may have affected the change. Referring to Table A in McNemar (36) the "t" is interpreted as a Critical Ratio and it can be seen that the ratio, 1.17, indicates that in repeated experiments with this sample approximately 75 times in 100 the difference would be found to be "true," or 25 in 100 instances the difference would be a result of "chance."

Tabulation of data derived from the surveys conducted at the conclusion of each period of instruction indicated that the trainees, on the average felt that there was little difference in the two methods as student interest-stirring techniques although the role-playing method was rated higher than the conventional method in the matter of increasing student participation through questions and discussions. Insofar as student opinion as gauged by the survey is concerned, there appeared to be little difference between the two techniques in presenting or discussing subject matter which was applicable to everyday leadership problems of the noncommissioned officer students. A summary of the data obtained through the previously described survey is presented in Table IV (p. 53). It should be noted that figures listed under "Periods of Instruction" are <u>averages</u> of all student ratings obtained for that particular period. Also, that <u>item averages</u> are indicated by check mark (✓) on the sample graphic scale for clarification and simplification of interpretation.

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
SURVEY DATA

5th. (Control) Class Periods of Instruction* 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Average	Items	6th. (Experimental) Class Periods of Instruction* 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Average
55	53	55	48	53	1. Did the subject matter of today's instruction apply to your everyday problems in leadership as a non-commissioned officer? (Not at all applicable. / Not very applicable. / Applicable in certain parts. / Fairly applicable throughout. / Applicable to a very great extent.) 6th. 5th.	54	55	49	51	52
52	43	54	36	46	2. In my opinion, the method or technique of presenting today's instruction was— (dry and uninteresting. / not particularly interesting. / fairly interesting. / very interesting. / highly interesting) 5th. 6th.	51	52	51	52	52
54	49	55	42	50	3. Considering the class as a group, I had the impression that they were— (not at all interested or attentive. / not very interested or attentive. / interested or attentive to parts of instruction / fairly interested or attentive throughout. / highly interested or attentive throughout.) 5th. 6th.	55	55	54	51	54
39	53	17	54	41	4. The general level of student participation (i.e., questions, discussions, etc.) during this period of instruction was— (non-existent (no questions or discussions / relatively low (one or two questions, etc.) / moderate (several questions and discussions). / fairly high (many questions and discussions). / exceedingly high (a great number of questions and discussions).) 5th. 6th.	44	58	52	58	53
50	55	45	45	48		50	55	52	53	53

* Ratings for periods of instruction are averages for each group

Staff Comments

In addition to the somewhat objective measurement of student attitudes provided by the Opinionaire and the subjective rating of instruction by the trainees, separate comments submitted by the Instructor of the Experimental Group and the Officer-in-Charge gave yet a third perspective of the experiment, especially in regard to the effectiveness of role-playing as assessed by these two officers. Inasmuch as their comments were made informally in correspondence they will not be discussed at greath length.

The Instructor of the Experimental Group stated[9] that, for the most part, the men who ranked high in the class "were receptive to our experiment and co-operated even though they could not... bring themselves to accept role-playing's effectiveness." He points out that the heterogeneity of the group (from the standpoint of military job occupations) made it "most difficult" to develop problems of a leadership nature having "universal application."[10] This officer further commented that the Group's "original enthusiasm" for the method soon wore off and lapsed into an attitude that role-playing was "silly and ineffective." He

---

[9] Feigan, 26 March 1952.

[10] In the opinion of the writer, a close examination and review of the various functional fields represented among students in the Leadership Course reveals one fact that appears to invalidate this observation. That single fact is that the only variable common to all noncommissioned officer leaders is that they lead and supervise men and that leadership principles, by definition, are universally applicable. This observation, of course, does not deny the difficulty in developing leadership problems of an inter-personal nature to illustrate accepted principles of good leadership.

concludes his remarks by pointing out that he had had no previous experience in the teaching field prior to being assigned to the Leadership Course and that the apparent ineffectiveness of role-playing might have been due to "tactless handling and amateurish technique."

The Officer-in-Charge submitted other comments[11] which indicates that he was able to sit in on several of the role-playing sessions for a short time. From these observations, he states that role-playing appeared to be an effective method for teaching small groups of men with similar interests and backgrounds. As an example, he suggests "all squad leaders" of a rifle company or a battalion. Also, he points out the necessity of proper "spacing," that is, separating two role-playing sessions with leadership instruction presented by more conventional methods. It will be recalled that the initial eight hours (first four periods) of this sub-course was devoted to role-playing and discussion in the Experimental Group.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Role-playing leadership and supervisory training methods have been used with apparent success in certain business and industrial organizations since the method was first introduced as an instructional technique in the United States.

A review and analysis of material on the subject of role-playing in industrial supervisory training resulted in the development of a technique which appeared to be suitable and applicable to the instructional situation of an established troop school in a large organization of the Marine Corps. The technique adapted for use had as its basis the idea that meaningful participation can be an essential to efficient and effective learning. The role-playing technique developed for use in the experimental situation, therefore, included active participation of the trainee group in determining their every day problems in leadership or man-management, the spontaneous dramatization of sketches illustrating these problems, and evaluation and discussion by the trainee group of the specific problem "acted out" by the actor-participants. The purpose of the technique was to change and develop-their respective attitudes toward military leadership methods and practices considered "good" by the school instructional staff and to provide insight into the leadership and man-management

problems faced by noncommissioned officers in the every day work situation.

The troop school co-operating in the experimental study was the Leadership Course (for Noncommissioned Officers), 2nd Marine Division, Fleet Marine Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. A review of the formal instruction (classroom) in leadership presented in the course revealed that conventional methods, such as lectures and a training film, were used in conjunction with several hours of conference (discussion) periods on leadership problems.

Two classes of approximately eighty men each were used in the experiment. Experimental design was the familiar Control-Experimental Group type with individuals paired on the basis of scores achieved in the pre-experiment administration of a military leadership attitude measuring instrument.

The measuring device used was an Opinionaire on military leadership methods, practices and opinions developed by the writer from an industrial supervisory opinionaire. The test, consisting of 100 items in a single form, was used in both pre- and post-experiment efforts to measure student attitude by scoring their verbalized opinions against a scoring key derived from results obtained in an administration of the test to the Course instructional staff. The memory factor in using the single form within a three-week period was discounted in view of the concentrated activity and numerous scheduled examinations in the curriculum.

In addition to the Opinionaire, two different judgments were obtained as a further indication of the effectiveness of the technique utilized in the study. The first was a survey of students obtained at the conclusion of each period of classroom instruction in an effort to obtain their opinion regarding the applicability of subject matter presented in that period, the degree of interest shown by the individual and the class, and the level of student participation as indicated by the amount of questions and discussions engaged in by members of the group. The second judgment was obtained from the Instructor of the Experimental Group and the Officer-in-Charge of the Course who also was the Instructor for the Control Group.

The "Control" Class received the standard instruction presented by conventional methods (lectures, a training film, and conferences). The "Experimental" Class Instructor used a role-playing technique developed for use in the study. As originally planned, the Instructor for the Control Class was to have used the two methods for the two classes, the conventional method with the Control and the experimental method with the Experimental Class. However, unforeseeable developments necessitated an eleventh-hour change and a newly assigned officer was required to use the experimental technique with the 6th, or Experimental Class. This major change in the instructor variable was accepted--there was no alternative if the study was to be completed.

The effectiveness of the two methods was determined in terms

of the measured differences in attitude resulting from a comparison of the post-experiment mean scores of the Control and Experimental Groups. Separate evaluations of the experimental techniques were obtained from a comparison of ratings made by students in the two groups and judgments of the Instructor of the Experimental Class and the Officer-in-Charge. Student ratings were made on graphic scales numerically quantified for purposes of comparison and the officers' comments were opinions based on individual observation and were included in informal correspondence.

Conclusions

The assignment of a new instructor to the Experimental Class introduced a variable which could not be adequately controlled and which must be considered as an important factor in drawing conclusions from the study data. In view of this fact it will be impossible to state unequivocally that any obtained difference in attitude change or variation in student rating was caused by the experimental variable, i.e., role-playing, because of the possibility that the shift may have been caused by variation in instructor ability. The results, while inconclusive because of inadequate controls on the instructor variable, suggest that the experimental technique may have operated in this situation to cause the increased shift in attitude on the part of noncommissioned officers in the Experimental Group over those in the Control Group.

The difference between the post-experiment mean scores amounted to 5.9 points in favor of the former group. Statistically interpreted, this indicates that "chance" may operate in 25 cases out of every 100 to produce the same difference. While this "chance" factor is too large to reject the null hypothesis and accept the difference as "true," it is believed that the practical difference is sufficient to suggest a trend in favor of the experimental technique.

It is tentatively concluded, therefore, that the favorable shift may logically have been the result of role-playing and the apparently more extensive discussion and comment developed in these sessions as evidenced by the higher mean rating (53 points) by the Experimental Group in Survey Item Four (level of student participation as indicated by student discussion) than was made by the Control Group (41 points) in this Item. This tentative conclusion is made in the face of the unenthusiastic appraisal of the experimental technique given by many students and the Instructor at the end of the experiment.

The second purpose of this study, restated in question form, was — "Is role-playing an effective technique in leadership training of noncommissioned officers?" It is not possible to formulate a clearly affirmative or negative answer to this question from the results obtained in this study. However, results do indicate that, while the experimental technique may have been

effective to a limited degree in this experiment, previous experience as instructors and discussion leaders is essential for those contemplating the use of role-playing techniques in leadership training.

The experimental situation required the use of role-playing in the intial four periods (eight hours) of a Leadership sub-course. This concentration tended to "take the edge off" role-playing and its novelty soon wore off. This would lead to the logical conclusion that role-playing must be considered as an "instructional aid" to be used when the training situation appears to be most suitable for its use and not as a method around which an entire leadership training course, or sub-course, is built.

The experimental technique was appraised as "silly and ineffective" by many students and the Instructor felt that his technique was "amateurish." These observations lead to the conclusion that the instructor's inexperience and lack of confidence in using the technique may have contributed to the students' final opinion on role-playing as an instructional technique.

Recommendations

In view of the measurable shift in attitude toward military leadership methods and practices indicated in this experiment, it is recommended that more extensive research be conducted in troop schools in the use of role-playing as an instructional aid in

leadership training of noncommissioned officers. However, it is also recommended that any further experimentation with role-playing leadership training techniques be conducted only by experienced instructors who are convinced of the inherent value of the technique and who are prepared to accept its limitations as well as its advantages.

It is recommended that role-playing sessions be included in the leadership courses of schools presently training non-commissioned officers in order that a growing number of personnel will become familiar with the technique as an aid in training the formal leader who has been given authority but who is not necessarily adept in its use.

Finally, it is recommended that role-playing be considered as an "aid" to training and that it be integrated into the training program or course and used as any other instructional "aid" is used—when the situation appears to be suitable for its most effective use.

Suggestions for Further Study

Although the results in this study are inconclusive in regard to the effect of role-playing instructional techniques on student attitudes, it is believed that the experimental design and methodology used was essentially sound. Therefore, it is believed that further experimentation in this area would be fruitful, providing certain factors especially the instructor variable, are more adequately

controlled.

It is also suggested that future experimentation aim not only at providing trainee insight into leadership problems for the purpose of developing attitudes and changing behavior but that trainees be allowed to practice leadership skills under the supervision and guidance of an experienced leader-instructor. Although such studies will require experimental classes subdivided into small groups, the experimentation will be consistent with paragraph 24001 of the Marine Corps Manual (61) which states that training be "practical and interesting" and other instructions which emphasize the importance of supervised guidance in leadership training.

A thorough preliminary statistical analysis of the Opinionaire was not attempted in this study. Further research and experimentation to improve the reliability and validity of the test as an instrument for prediction and diagnosis should be of interest and of value to the service.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ansbacher, H. L., "German Military Psychology," Psychological Bulletin, 1941, 38, 370-385.

2. _____, "Lasting and Passing Aspects of German Military Psychology," Sociometry, 1949, 12, 301-312.

3. Argyris, Chris, Role-Playing in Action, Bulletin No. 16, May, 1951, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

4. Bavelas, Alex, "Role-Playing and Management Training, " Sociatry, 1947, 1, 183-191.

5. Borgatta, Edgar F., "The Use of Psychodrama, Sociodrama and Related Techniques in Social Psychological Research," Sociometry, 1950, 13, 244-246.

6. Bowman, Claude, C., "The Psychodramatic Method in Collegiate Instruction - A Case Study," Sociatry, 1948, 1, 421-430.

7. Bradford, Leland P., "The Future of Supervisory Training," Personnel, 1944, 22, 6-12.

8. Bradford, Leland P. and Lippitt, Ronald, "Role-Playing in Supervisory Training," Personnel, 1946, 22, 358-369.

9. Bradford, Leland P. and Sheats, Paul, "Complacency Shock as a Pre-requisite to Training," Sociatry, 1948-49, 2, 37-46.

10. Broaded, Charley H., " Statementof the Practical Application of Role-Playing as a Training Device," Sociometry, 1951, 14, 69-70.

11. Chase, Stuart, Roads to Agreement, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

12. Coleman, William, "Role-Playing as an Instructional Aid," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1948, 39-427-435.

13. Colley, Thomas J., Leadership and Tactical Training for Marine Corps Noncommissioned Officers. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Stanford University, 1950.

14. Cornyetz, Paul, "The Warming-Up Process of an Audience," Sociometry, 1945, 8, 456-463.

15. Cronbach, Lee, Essentials of Psychological Testing, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

16. Dale, Edgar, Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching, New York: Dryden Press, 1946.

17. Department of the Army, Pamphlet No. 22-1, "Leadership," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1948, (RESTRICTED).

18. Edwards, Allen L., Statistical Analysis for Students in Psychology and Education, New York: Rinehart and Co., 1946.

19. File, Quintin, and Hemmers, H. H., How Supervise?, Psychological Corporation, New York.

20. French, John R. P., Jr., "Role-Playing as a Method of Training Foremen," Sociometry, 1945, 8, 410-425.

21. Freyd, Max, "The Graphic Rating Scale," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1923, 14, 83-102.

22. Graham, Grace, Lieutenant, (W), USNR, and Hartz, Catherine, Lieutenant, (W), USNR, "Group Methods in ROC(W) Classes," Naval Training Bulletin, November, 1951.

23. Grambs, Jean D., "Dynamics of Psychodrama in the Teaching Situation," Sociatry, 1948, 1, 383-399.

24. Guilford, J. P., Psychometric Methods, New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1936.

25. Haas, Robert B., "Implications and Recommendations for Educational Practice," Sociatry, 1948-49, 2, 420-444.

26. Halsey, George D., Training Employees, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

27. Harris, Henry, The Group Approach to Leadership Testing, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949.

28. Hoslett, Schuyler Dean, "Training in Human Relations," Personnel, 1946-23, 85-97.

29. Jennings, Helen H., "Military Use of Sociometric and Situation Tests in Great Britian, France, Germany and the United States," Sociometry, 1949, 12, 191-200.

30. Jucius, Michael, J. Personnel Management, Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, 1951.

31. Krech, David and Crutchfield, Richard S., Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948.

32. Liverright, A. A., "Role-Playing in Leadership Training," Personnel Journal, 1951, 29, 412-418.

33. Lippitt, Ronald, "The Psychodrama in Leadership Training," Sociometry, 1943, 6, 286-293.

34. Longenecker, J. O., Role-Playing as a Method in Training First Line Supervisors in Human Relations, unpublished Master's Thesis, Ohio State University, 1950.

35. McNemar, Quinn, "Opinion-Attitude Methodology," Psychological Bulletin, 1946, 43, 289-375.

36. _____, Psychological Statistics, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1949.

37. Miller, Delbert C., "Introductory Demonstrations and Applications of Three Major Uses of Role-Playing for Business and Government Administrators," Sociometry, 1951, 14, 48-49.

38. Moreno, J. L., "The Situation Test in American-British Military Psychology vs German Military Psychology," Sociometry, 1949, 12, 344-353.

39. _____, Sociodrama - A Method for the Analysis of Social Conflict, Beacon, N. Y. : Beacon House, 1944.

40. Payne, Stanley L., "The Ideal Model for Controlled Experiments," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1951, 15, 551-562.

41. Pennington, L. A. Hough, R. B. and Gage, N. W., The Psychology of Military Leadership, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1943.

42. Pfiffner, John M., The Supervision of Personnel, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951.

43. Roethlisberger, F. J., "The Human Equation in Employees Productivity," an address before the Personnel Group, National Retail Dry Goods Association, NRDGA Booklet, 1948.

44. Second Marine Division, Curriculum for Three-Weeks' NCO Leaders' Course, Camp Lejeune, N. C., (Undated).

45. Second Marine Division, Division Training Order No. 24-51, "Division NCO Leaders' Course," Camp Lejeune, N. C., 20 December 1951.

46. Second Marine Division, Student Information Bulletin, NCO Leaders' Course, Camp Lejeune, N. C. (Undated).

47. Stagner, Ross, Psychology of Personality, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.

48. Stouffer, Samuel A., "Some Observations on Study Design," American Journal of Sociology, 1950, 55, 355-361.

49. Stuit, Dewey B., ed., Personnel Research and Test Development in the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.

50. Symonds, Percival M., "Role-Playing as a Diagnostic Procedure in the Selection of Leaders," Sociometry, 1947, 1, 43-50.

51. Taylor, Bill N., "Some Supervisors Won't Learn," Personnel Journal, 1952, 30, 342-344.

52. Tead, Ordway, The Art of Leadership, New York: Whittlesey House, 1935.

53. Thorndike, Robert L., Personnel Selection, New York: John Wiley, 1949.

54. Thurstone, L. L., "Attitudes Can be Measured," American Journal of Sociology, 1928, 33, 529-554.

55. Tyler, Allen H., "A Case Study of Role-Playing," Personnel, 1948, 24, 136-142.

56. U. S. Congress, Senate, Preparedness Sub-Committee of the Committee on Armed Services, Report on Conditions at Six Navy and Marine Corps Training Centers, 31st Report, 82nd Congress, 1st Session, S. Res. 18, Washington: 1951.

57. U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Universal Military Training, Foundation of Enduring National Strength, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, H. Document No. 715, Washington: 1952.

58. U. S. Marine Corps, General Order No. 65, "Individual Consideration," Washington: 8 February, 1950.

59. U. S. Marine Corps, General Order No. 82, "Individual Training of Enlisted Men," Washington: 24 January, 1951.

[illegible]

60. U. S. Marine Corps, Letter from Commandant to Lt. Colonel John B. Sweeney, 79 W. Kanawha Avenue, Worthington, Ohio, Excerpts of Inspector General's Reports, Washington: 13 February, 1952.

61. U. S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Manual, Chapter 24, "Training of Enlisted Men," Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1948.

62. U. S. Marine Corps, Marine Corps Schools 1-15, "The Non-commissioned Officer Leader," Quantico, Va.: Marine Corps Educational Center, 1950.

63. U. S. Navy, Manual for the Practical Development of Leadership Qualities, Washington: Bureau of Naval Personnel and Training, October, 1944.

64. War Department (Department of the Army), Field Manual 22-5, "Leadership, Courtesy and Drill," Washington: 1946.

65. Webster's New International Dictionary, Unabridged, Second Edition, Springfield (Mass): G. & C. Merriman Co.

66. Wherry, Robert J., Psychology 608, "Psychological Statistics," unpublished laboratory problems, Summer Quarter, 1951, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

67. Zander, Alvin and Lippitt, Ronald, "Reality Practice and Educational Method," Sociometry, 1944, 7, 129-151.

68. Zander, Alvin, "Role-Playing: A Technique for Training the Necessarily Dominating Leader," Sociatry, 1947, 1, 226-234.

APPENDIX I

OPINIONAIRE

on

Non-Tactical Leadership
Methods, Practices and Opinions
(Adapted from "How Supervise?" by File and Remmers)

Name .... Rank .....USMC - USMCR

Military Occupational Specialty No. ..... Age .....

Date ..... Have you ever taken a Noncommissioned

Officer's training course? ..... Where?..... When.....

Number of men working directly under your direction in your

last assignment before entering this course .....

Education: (Encircle last year completed)

Grade School	High School	College
4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

INTRODUCTION

All well known writers on the subject of military leadership agree that "noncommissioned officers are the backbone of any organization" and that a good outfit cannot succeed without loyal, well-disciplined noncommissioned officers. This Opinionaire is made up of items related to non-tactical leadership situations which may be encountered by you, as a noncommissioned officer in any Marine Corps unit. The list of statements is divided into three sections, POLICIES, PRACTICES AND OPINIONS. Please answer each item according to the directions at the beginning of each section.

Section 1

Policies

The following list of policies or methods could be used by various leaders in handling men in their respective units. Some of these will seem desirable to you and some undesirable. Please answer each item according to <u>your opinion</u> of its value in producing morale and esprit de corps.

D Desirable ? Uncertain U Undesirable

Draw a circle around the answer which best represents your opinion.

1. Keeping the men informed of work or training outlook in the forseeable future and the plans for accomplishing that work or training.....D ? U

2. Training NCOs to handle complaints and gripes of men under them.....D ? U

3. Publishing reports or statements on the results of inspections in which the unit participated.....D ? U

4. Holding the supervisor (Officer or NCO-in-Charge) responsible for the conditions in his unit..... D ? U

5. Making the private in the rear rank feel that he is an important part of the unit ..... D ? U

6. Making assignments to the better billets on the basis of length of service ..... D ? U

7. Assigning NCOs on the basis of how much they know about the different jobs they are to have ..... D ? U

8. Giving men who are working or training a ten minute break every hour ..... D ? U

9. Publishing the names of men who have received recent promotions and the new jobs to which they have been assigned ..... D ? U

10. Requiring NCOs to attend weekly training sessions on subjects relating to their profession... .... D ? U

11. Asking the advice of senior NCOs on certain problems relating to the men ..... D ? U

12. Promoting and encouraging recreation and morale projects, such as athletic teams, hobby shops, etc..... D ? U

13. Providing special channels, (such as "Request Mast") for hearing and adjusting serious grievances..... D ? U

14. Holding a supervisor responsible for the quality of work turned out in his section ..... D ? U

15. Providing special interviews for men up for discharge who have indicated no desire to re-enlist..... D ? U

16. Allowing NCOs to have more frequent leaves of absence than men of lesser rank ..... D ? U

17. Realizing consistent discipline in the unit by treating all offenders on the same basis..... D ? U

18. Helping to solve personal problems of the men when requested ..... D ? U

19. Requiring each NCO to take a prominent and active part in the training of his unit ..... D ? U

20. Promoting only those men who have demonstrated ability in their speciality, regardless of relative seniority ..... D ? U

21. Informing the men, whenever possible, of what is going on outside of their unit..... D ? U

22. Issuing definite rules and instructions for handling all the details of work to each NCO placed in charge of a detail ..... D ? U

23. Training subordinate leaders in independence, initiative and a sense of responsibility by allowing them some freedom of action within their own sphere.. D ? U

24. Training subordinate leaders to make quick decisions in noncombat leadership situations using those facts which are immediately available..... D ? U

25. Allowing discipline to "ease up" whenever possible but "cracking down" when it becomes necessary..... D ? U

26. Requiring leaders to set a good example of conduct for those men directly in their charge and for others with whom the leaders come in contact..... D ? U

27. Requiring cleanliness and neatness of the men in the organization..... D ? U

28. Observing the rule that when an offender has paid his penalty and learned his "lesson" he starts afresh with a clean slate..... D ? U

Section II

Practices

The following list of practices could be used by various non-commissioned officers. Some of them will seem desirable to you and some undesirable. Please indicate your answer according to how you feel about using such a practice as your own.

D Desirable ? Uncertain U Undesirable

Draw a circle around the answer which best represents your opinion.

29. Admitting to your men when you have made a wrong decision..... D ? U

30. Telling each man whether he is improving or not, and if so, how much..... D ? U

31. Becoming familiar with supervisory methods and leadership techniques used by NCOs in other outfits..... D ? U

32. Telling a man the reasons for changes he is required to make in his work..... D ? U

33. Explaining Marine Corps policies about the promotion of enlisted men..... D ? U

34. Asking a man to criticize his own work..... D ? U

35. Praising a man for a job even if it doesn't come up to what you think it should be..... D ? U

36. Keeping an informal record on each man in your unit or section..... D ? U

37. Setting up the man who consistently does the best job as an example for other men to follow..... D ? U

38. Explaining to men who have made unusable suggestions about improving work or training procedures why their ideas cannot be put into use ..... D ? U

39. Mentioning the names of men, at unit musters, who have done poor work during the past..... D ? U

40. Giving all extra work details to the most inefficient men in your unit..... D ? U

41. Listening to apparently unreasonable gripes from men and then forgetting about them..... D ? U

42. Asking your men for suggestions before starting an important piece of work..... D ? U

43. Arranging for the transfer of dissatisfied, but capable individuals to other units..... D ? U

44. Telling inefficient men in your unit to "get busy or get out" ..... D ? U

45. Recommending your best men for promotion even though you will lose their services once they are promoted.. D ? U

46. Instructing the next senior man in your unit on how to handle your job..... D ? U

47. Recommending your best men for transfer to another unit because they will be detailed to more responsible duties..... D ? U

48. Making efforts to smooth out personal dislikes among the men in your unit..... D ? U

49. Making an example of one man who has committed an insignificant violation of regulations in order to prevent further trouble with other men in the outfit. D ? U

50. Explaining in detail all new orders and instructions affecting the men in your unit..... D ? U

51. Urging your men to handle their own problems without seeking advice from anyone..... D ? U

52. Dividing extra work details as equally as possible among all the men in your unit..... D ? U

53. Suggesting to men who approach you with personal problems that they "go see the chaplain"..... D ? U

54. Exacting discipline in the unit on the basis that certain men (the 10% who don't get the word) who get out of line will "get the works" while the other men will get some individual consideration..... D ? U

55. Learning to do a job by the application method, that is, by actually doing it "on the job"..... D ? U

56. Making your men feel that you will listen to what they have to say..... D ? U

57. Reprimanding a subordinate leader in front of the other men is a good way to let them know who is the boss..... D ? U

58. Striving to learn the limitations of each man in doing his job..... D ? U

59. Explaining to a new man exactly how to do a certain job rather than showing him..... D ? U

60. Rendering tactful advice to less experienced junior officers when such a course of action appears to be appropriate..... D ? U

Section III

Opinions

The following are opinions held by various NCOs in the Marine Corps. You will probably agree with some of the statements and disagree with others. Please indicate how you feel about each item by marking the statements as follows:

A Agree ? Uncertain DA Disagree

Draw a circle around the answer which best represents your opinion.

61. The nature of an NCO's duty makes it necessary for him to be disliked by his men..... A ? DA

62. What a man thinks is unimportant so long as he is doing his job well..... A ? DA

63. Praising men for good work only leads them to expect promotions or special considerations..... A ? DA

64. What a man does during his "off duty time" is of no concern to his NCO..... A ? DA

65. The way a man is treated by his fellow Marines will probably determine whether he likes his duty assignment or not..... A ? DA

66. If a man is capable of doing a job, he will become interested in it without any stimulation from the man he is working for..... A ? DA

67. The only important requirement for an NCO is a complete understanding of the jobs in the unit for which he is responsible..... A ? DA

68. Ability to handle men is inborn, not learned..... A ? DA

69. A man who is passed over in a promotion is entitled to know why..... A ? DA

70. NCOs are usually criticized more than they deserve... A ? DA

71. If a man goes over your head with a grievance or complaint, it is usually a sign of poor supervision or leadership on your part..... A ? DA

72. A noncommissioned officer is a misfit unless he has the confidence and loyalty of his men..... A ? DA

73. Rapid learners are usually quick forgetters..... A ? DA

74. Most men do a good job if they get a good bawling out now and then..... A ? DA

75. A man's opinion of his NCO is not very important.. . A ? DA

76. Lying, though distasteful, is often necessary to keep a group of men working..... A ? DA

77. Training is needed to produce good NCOs..... A ? DA

78. Keeping a man afraid of you is the best way to insure that he will do a good day's work..... A ? DA

79. Fast workers usually make more mistakes than slow workers..... A ? DA

80. The prestige of noncommissioned officers is lessened when subordinates must be handled as individuals, each with his own viewpoint, desires, needs and interests..... A ? DA

81. A good NCO supervisor must be able to do all the jobs performed by the men he supervises..... A ? DA

82. A good NCO can tell what a man is worth the first time he talks with him..... A ? DA

83. The first duty of a NCO when handling a complaint is to point out to the man where he is wrong..... A ? DA

84. Most men will do better work when constantly watched by the NCO-in-charge..... A ? DA

85. Less intelligent men tend to resent monotonous tasks more than the average individual..... A ? DA

86. Acting as a counselor to his men isn't part of a NCO's job..... ..... A ? DA

87. Obtaining information about current administrative regulations (daily routine, uniform of the day, etc.) is the individual responsibility of every Marine and not the concern of their NCO..... A ? DA

88. Checking on the adequacy and care of their men's clothing is solely the duty of the Officer leader and is not the concern of the NCO..... A ? DA

89. The best way a NCO can get respect from his men is by being severe and "tough"..... A ? DA

90. Praising a man for doing his duty is a bad idea..... A ? DA

91. Men usually resent it if their NCO leader takes a personal interest in them..... A ? DA

92. One of the best ways for an NCO leader to obtain the friendship and cooperation of men is to associate with them whenever possible at the EM Club, on liberty, etc A ? DA

93. Striving to understand men as individuals will be to no avail because men in a military organization have to be treated alike..... A ? DA

94. Trying to improve yourself in leadership techniques can be of little use since a leader is born, not made A ? DA

95. Military discipline must be founded on a mechanical and uninquiring submission to orders..... A ? DA

96. Many noncommissioned officers of today are deficient in desirable qualities of leadership..... A ? DA

97. Present man-management methods and practices in the military profession are proving to be satisfactory and, therefore, there is no need to keep abreast of new developments in this area that may be of use to the military..... A ? DA

98. It is essential that the NCO leader maintain himself in good physical condition in order that he will be able to have the patience and judgment necessary to the proper solution of his problems..... A ? DA

99. Besides knowing his job, an NCO should possess a background of knowledge to lead his group in thought and action..... A ? DA

100. It is a good practice to avoid undue familiarity with juniors..... A ? DA

APPENDIX II

Name_____

SURVEY

This survey is part of a study aimed at improving the technique of classroom leadership instruction for subsequent classes in the Second Marine Division Leaders' Course. The survey is made up of several items relating to the technique or method used in presenting today's instruction. Please be frank and honest in giving your opinion. There is no RIGHT or CORRECT answer to any question or item. It is desired only to obtain your OPINION on each of the items. Befor answering the numbered items please fill in the following blank space using information given to the class by your instructor:

Date_____ Period of instruction_____

Subject matter or title_____

Method of instruction_____

Mark ( ) on each line the position which most nearly approximates your opinion regarding the particular item or statement in question.

1. Did the subject matter of today's classroom instruction apply to your everyday problems in leadership as a noncommissioned officer ?

Not at all applicable.	Not very applicable.	Applicable in certain parts.	Fairly applicable throughout.	Applicable to a very great extent.

2. In my opinion, the method or technique of presenting today's instruction was--

dry and uninteresting.	not particularly interesting.	fairly interesting.	very interesting.	highly interesting.

3. Considering the class as a group, I had the impression that they were--

not at all interested or attentive.	not very interested or attentive.	interested or attentive to parts of instruction.	fairly interested or attentive thruout.	highly interested or attentive throughout.

4. The general level of student participation (i.e., questions, discussions, etc.) during this period of instruction was--

non-existent (no questions or discussions).	relatively low (one or two questions and discussions).	moderate (several questions and discussions).	fairly high (many questions and discussions).	exceedingly high (a great number of questions and discussions).